

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The amendments to this patent application are as follows.

Independent claim 1 has been amended in order to recite the subject matter of claim 2. Thus, claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. Dependent claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice and has been rewritten as new independent claim 8.

Claims 4, 5, 6, and 7 depend from independent claim 1 as amended. Newly added dependent claims 9, 10, 11, and 12 depend from new independent claim 8. Newly added dependent claim 9 corresponds to claim 4. Newly added dependent claim 10 corresponds to claim 5. Newly added dependent claim 11 corresponds to claim 6. Newly added dependent claim 12 corresponds to claim 7.

In summary, Claims 4, 5, 6, and 7 depend from amended claim 1, whereas newly added claims 9, 10, 11, and 12 depend from new claim 8.

On Page 2 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0048422 to Cotteverte et al.

On Page 3 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has merely objected to claims 2 to 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent claim format including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Therefore, in response to this prior art rejection of claims 1 and 4 to 7, claim 1 was amended to include the features of claim 2, and dependent claim 3 was cancelled and rewritten as new independent claim 8. Hence, all of the claims either correspond to allowed claim 2 (i.e. claim 1) or correspond to allowed claim 3 (i.e. claim 8).

Consequently, this prior art rejection has now been rendered moot. Withdrawal of this prior art rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Cotteverte, is respectfully requested.

Also being filed herewith is a Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement with enclosures.

For all of the above reasons, none of the prior art references provide an identical disclosure of the claimed invention. Hence, the present invention is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, but is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over all the prior art applied by the Patent Examiner. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested. A prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Javier MARTI SENDRA ET AL.



Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,298  
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048  
Attorneys for Applicants

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 Northern Boulevard  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802  
ERF:lgh

Enclosures: 1. Copy Petition One Month Extension of Time  
2. Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 2, 2008.

  
Amy Klein